DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 231 575 RC 014 181

AUTHOR Bottenfield, James F.
TITLE Iowa Annual Evaluation Report for Migrant Programs, Fiscal Year 1982.
INSTITUTION Iowa State Dept. of Public Instruction, Des Moines.
PUB DATE Mar 83
NOTE 17p.; For related document, see ED 211 318.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Cooperation; *Ancillary School Services; Annual Reports; *Compensatory Education; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment; *Migrant Education; Migrant Health Services; *Migrant Programs; Parent Participation; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Spanish Speaking; *State Programs; Student Recruitment; Summer Programs
IDENTIFIERS ESEA Title I Migrant Programs; *Iowa

ABSTRACT

During fiscal year 1982, five regular school year and three summer migrant programs were conducted in Iowa. In the regular school year programs, 11 teachers and 2 aides (all bilingual) served 251 K-12 students, 211 of whom were Spanish dominant. During the summer programs, 8 teachers and 6 aides (all bilingual) served 168 K-12 students, 121 of whom were Spanish dominant. Curriculum included English oral language development, reading, mathematics, and cultural development. Health, music, art, and field trips were also provided during the summer. Staff received inservice training in all programs. Supportive services included nutritional services and vision, audio, dental, and immunization screenings, with treatment administered when necessary. The local education agencies (LEAs) employed various methods to recruit migrant children and to establish the children's educational needs. An unduplicated count of 127 migrant parents participated in some manner with the schools. The LEAs reported utilization of the Migrant Student Record System, especially the Skills List concept; cooperation with other agencies serving the migrant population; numerous methods to disseminate information; maintenance of contact with the State Education Agency; and successful assimilation of the educational components by the migrant children. (NQA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED231575

IOWA ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR MIGRANT PROGRAMS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Fiscal Year 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James L. Mitchell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

JUL 1983
RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

Department of Public Instruction

RC014181

5100-E29803-3/83

I O W A

A N N U A L E V A L U A T I O N R E P O R T

F O R M I G R A N T P R O G R A M S

F I S C A L Y E A R 1 9 8 2

by

James F. Bottenfield

Chapter 1 of Public Law 97-35

Education Consolidation and Improvement Act

State of Iowa
Department of Public Instruction
Des Moines, Iowa

State of Iowa
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

STATE BOARD OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Karen K. Goodenow, President, Wall Lake
William N. Cropp, Vice President, Des Moines
Jolly Ann Davidson, Clarinda
Lucas DeKoster, Hull
Stephen C. Gerard, Sigourney
John Moats, Council Bluffs
Dianne L.D. Paca, Garner
Mary E. Robinson, Cedar Rapids
Susan M. Wilson, Waterloo

ADMINISTRATION

Robert D. Benton, State Superintendent and Executive Officer of the State Board of Public Instruction
David H. Bechtel, Administrative Assistant
James E. Mitchell, Deputy State Superintendent

Pupil Personnel Services Branch

Drexel D. Lange, Associate Superintendent
Oliver T. Himley, Chief, Chapter 1, ECIA
James F. Bottenfield, Migrant Consultant, Chapter 1, ECIA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Regular Term	Page
Unduplicated Number of Children and Staff	1
Inservice for Staff	1
Medical	2
Recruiting and Establishing Educational Needs	2
Parent Involvement	3
Cooperation With Other Programs and Agencies	3
Dissemination	4
SEA Contact with LEAs	4
Instructional Activities	4
Summer Term	
Unduplicated Number of Children and Staff	6
Inservice for Staff	7
Medical	7
Recruiting and Establishing Educational Needs	7
Parent Involvement	8
Cooperation With Other Programs and Agencies	8
Dissemination	8
SEA Contact with LEAs	9
Instructional Activities	9

TABLES

Statewide Migrant Instructional Activities (Regular Term)	5
Statewide Migrant Instructional Activities (Summer Term)	10
Muscatine Language Development Program Test Results	11

IOWA ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
FOR CHAPTER 1 MIGRANT PROGRAMS

Fiscal Year 1982

There were six migrant educational programs in Iowa for Fiscal Year 1982. There were five programs conducted during the regular school year, and two programs conducted during the summer months.

For the regular school year, there were two hundred fifty-one (251) children enrolled. The breakdown in classification was one hundred nine interstate, eleven intrastate, and one hundred thirty-one five-year provisional children. Gradewise there were twenty-nine kindergarten, one hundred ninety-six elementary, and twenty-six secondary children enrolled.

Inasmuch as the children were enrolled in the regular school curriculum during the regular school year, the Chapter 1 Migrant program was supplementary in nature. There were eleven teachers and two teacher aides all of whom were bilingual providing additional services for the children. The curricular areas provided by the migrant program were in English oral language development, reading, mathematics, and cultural development. Of the two hundred fifty-one children enrolled, two hundred eleven were Spanish dominate. The average daily attendance was one hundred fifty with the highest daily attendance of two hundred fifty-one for the school year.

Inservice of staff as reported by the LEAs for the regular school year included teachers, aides, nurses, and administrators.

The inservice areas were in general program orientation, curriculum methods, individualized instruction, classroom management, use of MSRTS, instructional objectives, student placement and diagnosis, and culture of the migrant child. The LEAs reported that sixty staff members were involved in the inservice meetings which indicates that the migrant educational program was reaching out and involving the regular staff members to create a better understanding of the migrant child.

Supportive services to the migrant children as reported by the LEAs included one hundred seventy-two visional screenings which led to one child receiving glasses; ninety-three audio screenings which led to one child receiving a hearing aid; eleven dental/medical screenings which required no further treatment necessary; all of the children's immunization records were screened, and no shots were needed; which was a relief to the children.

Nutritional services were provided the migrant children on the same basis as other children enrolled in school; and if the migrant child's parents could not afford the hot lunch, the children were given free lunches.

The process of recruiting migrant children included a variety of methods by the LEAs. The methods reported in recruiting were visits by school representatives with the local groweres or food processors, visits to the migrant camps, visits with other local community agencies, and, in some instances, the parents voluntarily sending or bringing their children to school.

In establishing the educational needs of the children, the LEAs utilized the Migrant Student Record Transfer System, criterion

referenced tests, standardized tests, teacher-made tests, and other teacher referrals as they met with other staff members.

Parental involvement was also diversified which led to an unduplicated count of one hundred twenty-seven parents participating in some manner with the schools. These methods utilized by the LEAs included thirty-eight parents attending orientation meetings concerning the migrant educational program; nineteen parents were involved in planning project activities; seventy-seven parents visited in their child's classroom; twenty-three parents were active in recruitment; five parents helped supervise field trips; eight parents acted as aides; ninety-three parents were contacted by school staff in their homes; one hundred four attended school functions such as open house and other related functions; fifteen parents participated in their local Parent Advisory Council; and twelve parents served on the State Parent Advisory Council with six attending a SEA workshop conducted by State migrant personnel, one parent attended the National State Directors convention.

The LEAs reported utilization of the Migrant Student Record System. They were especially enthused with the Skills List concept. A state training session was held to indoctrinate the teachers with the skills list and how to use them. In addition, follow-up training sessions were held in each LEA migrant center to reinforce the proper use of the skills lists. During the follow-up sessions, the whole concept of the MSRTS was explained with each staff member gaining an understanding of their role in making the MSRTS operate as it should for the benefit of the migrant children.

Cooperation between the LEAs and other agencies serving the migrant population was maintained according to reports from the

LEAs. The other agencies were the Local Migrant Council, Community Action, local Chapter 1 projects, County Health Department, CETA, School Lunch Program, Department of Social Services, Project Head Start, and Local Day Care Center.

The LEAs reported numerous ways utilized in disseminating information concerning their migrant educational programs. Among the methods reported were local newspaper articles, use of brochures or newsletters, oral and written communication with parents of the migrant children, reports to their local school boards, discussion with other migrant staff at SEA sponsored workshops, and visitation with other migrant programs.

Contact between the LEAs and the SEA was maintained by SEA inservice meeting, telephone contact, letters, and program visitation by the SEA. During these contacts, the SEA assisted the LEAs in developing their project application, responding to financial questions or problems, completion of required report forms, clarification of guidelines, and developing their evaluation report.

In reporting on the instructional activities supported by migrant funds, the LEAs felt that by their standards of success by age level, the migrant children's assimilation of the educational components was attained. The following is a composite report from the LEAs.

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITES

Instructions: This page is to be utilized in recording success data. Beside each activity that was part of your project indicate:

A. The number of participants by age level
B. The number meeting your standard(s) of success by age level
C. Total number of participants per activity

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY		AGE LEVEL							C. TOTAL NO. OF PARTICIPANTS
		3-5*	6-8	9-10	11-12	13-14	15-16	17-18	
Mathematics	A			7	12	18	14		51
	B			6	11	16	13		
English Language Arts/Reading	A	23	39	15	46	37	23	6	189
	B	17	32	12	36	28	16	3	
Spanish Language Arts/ Reading	A		1	5					6
	B		1	4					
English Oral Language	A	22	45	19	39	35	21	6	187
	B	15	35	16	30	29	13	2	
Science	A								
	B								
Social Studies	A								
	B								
Cultural Development/ Self-Image	A	7	7	9	24	25	18	2	92
	B	7	7	9	24	23	17	2	
Physical Education	A								
	B								
Career Education	A								
	B								
Health/ Nutrition	A								
	B								
Fine Arts	A								
	B								
Practical Arts	A								
	B								
Music/Dance	A								
	B								
Other (specify) Promoted/ Graduated	A		5	5	6	3	5	4	28
	B		5	5	6	3	5	3	

*Include readiness skills in applicable instructional activity categories

For each instructional activity for your projects listed in the preceding section, please complete the following: a) List the instruments used to determine pupil progress. (Specify the names of commercially prepared instruments. Noncommercial instruments should be briefly described; e.g., teacher-made checklist on primary language skills.)

For the Fiscal Year 1982 summer there were three programs for the migrant children. One of the programs encompassed an area comprised of four LEAs. This combining into one summer program gave us a sufficient number of children to efficiently add more educational components to the migrant program.

The three summer programs served a total of one hundred sixty-eight children. The breakdown in classification was sixty-four interstate, and one hundred four five-year provisional children. Gradewise there were twenty-two kindergarten, one hundred thirty-eight elementary children, and eight secondary children enrolled.

There were eight teachers and six teacher aides, all of whom were bilingual. In addition, two administrators, one recruiter, two clerks, three hot lunch cooks, and two bus drivers employed in the summer programs. The curricular areas provided by the migrant programs were in English oral language development, reading, mathematics, cultural development, health, music, and art. Of the one hundred sixty-eight children enrolled, one hundred twenty-one were Spanish dominate. The average daily attendance was one hundred fifteen with the highest daily attendance of one hundred thirty-five for the summer program.

The project duration for one of the summer projects was twenty-eight class days, one for thirty days, and the other project was thirty-one class days.

Inservice of staff as reported by the LEAs for the summer term included teachers, aides, recruiters, nurses, clerks, and administrators. The inservice areas were in general program orientation,

curriculum methods, individualized instruction, grouping techniques, use of MSRTS, utilization of teacher aides, instructional objectives, student placement and diagnosis, and cultural of the migrant child. The LEAs reported that sixteen staff members were involved in the inservice meetings.

Supportive services to the migrant children as reported by the LEAs included fifty-seven visional screenings, thirty dental screenings, and eleven medical screenings. No treatment was needed for either dental or medical reasons which attests to the general overall improvement in the health of the migrant children.

Nutritional services were provided free of charge to the summer migrant children. This included breakfast, mid-morning milk and snacks, hot lunch, and a mid-afternoon milk/juice and snacks.

Field trips to various places of interest to the children were arranged. The teachers made a point of including various aspects of the field trips into the daily lesson plans for the children. Regularly scheduled swimming lessons were also incorporated into the summer program.

The process of recruiting migrant children followed the same methods utilized during the regular school year. They included visits by school representatives to the migrant camps, visits with local growers or food processors, and information supplied by local community agencies.

In establishing the educational needs of the children, the LEAs utilized the Migrant Student Record System, criterion referenced tests, standardized tests, and teacher-made test.

Parental involvement with the summer school program was established by a diversification of methods which led to an unduplicated count of eighty-six parents participating in some manner with the schools. The methods utilized by the LEAs included thirteen parents attending orientation meetings concerning the summer migrant educational program; eleven parents were involved in planning project activities; forty-three parents visited in their child's classroom; eighteen parents were active in recruitment; seventy-eight parents were contacted by school staff in their homes; fifty parents attended school functions such as fiesta day; three parents participated in the local Parent Advisory Council; and three parents served on the State Parent Advisory Council.

The LEAs reported utilization of the Migrant Student Record System. They were very pleased with the Skills List concept when they received information on some of the children enrolled in the summer program. They took this as a sign that the MSRTS really works. A follow-up briefing at each summer attendance center refreshed their memory as to proper usage of the MSRTS.

Cooperation between the LEAs and other agencies serving the migrant population was maintained according to reports from the LEAs. The other agencies were the Local Migrant Council, Community Action Agencies, County Health Department, CETA, School Lunch Program, Department of Social Services, and Project Head Start.

The LEAs reported their dissemination of information concerning the summer migrant program via brochures or newsletters, oral and written communication with parents of the migrant children, reports to their local school boards, and discussion with other migrant staff at SEA sponsored meetings.

Contact between the LEAs and the SEA was maintained by SEA inservice meeting, telephone contact, letters, and program visitations by the SEA. During these contacts the SEA assisted the LEAs in developing their project applications, responding to financial questions or problems, completion of required report forms, clarification of guidelines, and developing their evaluation report.

In reporting on the instructional activities supported by migrant funds, the LEAs felt, that by their standards of success by age level, the migrant children's assimilation of the education components was attained. The following is a composite report from the LEAs.

SUMMER

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITES

Instructions: This page is to be utilized in recording success data. Beside each activity that was part of your project indicate:

A. The number of participants by age level
B. The number meeting your standard(s) of success by age level
C. Total number of participants per activity

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY		AGE LEVEL							C. TOTAL NO. OF PARTICIPANTS
		3-5*	6-8	9-10	11-12	13-14	15-16	17-18	
Mathematics	A		16	16	22	18			72
	B		10	10	15	14			
English Language Arts/Reading	A	19	19	17	29	20	4	2	110
	B	16	9	9	23	15	2	1	
Spanish Language Arts/ Reading	A								
	B								
English Oral Language	A	18	16	16	22	20	4	2	98
	B	18	16	16	19	20	3	1	
Science	A								
	B								
Social Studies	A								
	B								
Cultural Development/ Self-Image	A		16	16	22	20	4	2	80
	B		16	16	18	20	4	2	
Physical Education	A								
	B								
Career Education	A					2	4	2	8
	B					2	2	1	
Health/ Nutrition	A		16	16	22	18			72
	B		16	16	22	18			
Fine Arts	A								
	B								
Practical Arts	A								
	B								
Music/Dance	A								
	B								
Other (specify)	A								
	B								

*Include readiness skills in applicable instructional activity categories

For each instructional activity for your projects listed in the preceding section, please complete the following: a) List the instruments used to determine pupil progress. (Specify the names of commercially prepared instruments. Noncommercial instruments should be briefly described; e.g., teacher-made checklist on primary language skills.)

MUSCATINE COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

1981 - 82

Age Level	Test	No. of Children With Both Pre & Post Test Scores	Date of Pretest Mo. , Yr.	Average Pretest Percentile Score	Average Pretest Grade Equivalent	Date of Posttest Mo. Yr..	Average Posttest Percentile Score	Average Posttest Grade Euivalent
6-8	Peabody Picture Vocab.	14	9 / 81	Raw Score - 33		5 / 82	Raw Score 43	
8-10	Peabody Pic. Voc.	3	9 / 81	Raw Score - 39		5 / 82	Raw Score 52	
5-7	Metro. Rdg. Rdns. Level	I 16	Not Given	- - - -	- - - -	5 / 82	51%	
6-7	Metro. Rdg. Rdns. Level	II 3	9 / 81	31%	- - - -	5 / 82	63%	
6-9	Metro Primer	11	9 / 81	26%	- - - -	5 / 82	54%	
8-9	Metro Achiev. Primary I	4	9 / 81	- - - -	2.0	5 / 82	- - - -	3.0
9-11	Metro Achiev. Primary II	4	9 / 81	- - - -	2.7	5 / 82	- - - -	3.3
10-12	Metro Achiev Elementary	12	9 / 81	- - - -	3.0	5 / 82	- - - -	4.0
12-14	Metro Achiev Intermediate	7	9 / 81	- - - -	4.3	5 / 82	- - - -	5.7
13-14	C.E.L.T.	1	9 / 81	46%	- - - -	5 / 82	59%	
15-16	C.E.L.T.	3	9 / 81	27%	- - - -	5 / 82	41%	
17-18	C.E.L.T.	1	9 / 81	45%	- - - -	5 / 82	56%	
Ungraded Fountain Valley		52		Average Reading Skills Growth = 4.7 per month				